UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,949	08/21/2003	Andreas C. Pfahnl	077311-0117	2973
65902 7590 08/23/2007 TERADYNE, INC. c/o FOLEY & LARDER, LLP			EXAMINER	
			FORD, JOHN K	
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE 26TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02199-7610			3744	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	10/646,949	PFAHNL ET AL.
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	John K. Ford	3744
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC) personnel):	
(1) John K. Ford.	(3)	
(2) <u>David Rikkers</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 43 July 2007.	•	
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representative	e]
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.	·
Claim(s) discussed: None.		•
Identification of prior art discussed: None.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	g)⊠ was not reached. h)☐ N	N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the generateached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		if an agreement was
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amer allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attach	copy of the amendments that v	
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS IN FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTREQUIREMENTS on reverse side or on attached sheet.	ne last Office action has already R OF ONE MONTH OR THIRT TERVIEW SUMMARY FORM,	been filed, APPLICANT IS Y DAYS FROM THIS WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
·		
		•
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an		John K. Pard Primery Exeminer

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20070817

Examiner's signature, if required

Application No. 10/646,949

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection and how the examiner considered the term "remote" and "local" to be vague. This issue became particularly evident to the examijner in counsel's response of 8/21/2006, page 3, lines 1-3, where counsel argued that Scaringe did not disclose a "local" condenser. Since all of Scarainge's condensers were within his disclosed apparatus, the examiner was left to wonder what applicant felt were the limits of the words "local" and "remote". A review of applicant's own specification provides scant guidance. The examiner suggested that counsel might try to define the location of the various components relative to the circuit board or other (currently unclaimed) stucture without using the words "local" and "remote". A significant part of the problem is that the claims sweep very broadly, lacking recitations of much of the disclosed structure and relying instead on more nebulous words such as "local" and "remote".